HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 200313958-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Bill Serra et al.

Confirmation No.: 9830

Application No.: 10/697,688

Examiner: James J. Debrow

Filing Date: October 31, 2003

Group Art Unit: 2176

Title:

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on April 28, 2008.

☐ The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is $510.00 (37 CFR 41.20).

☒ No Additional Fee Required.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

☐ (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d)) for the total number of months checked below:

☐ 1st Month $120 ☐ 2nd Month $460 ☐ 3rd Month $1050 ☐ 4th Month $1640

☐ The extension fee has already been filed in this application.

☒ (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account 08-2025 the sum of $ 00. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees.

☐ A duplicate copy of this transmittal letter is enclosed.

☐ I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Date of Deposit:

OR

☒ I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571)273-8300.
Date of facsimile: June 30, 2008
Typed Name: Judy H. Chung
Signature:

Respectfully submitted,
Bill Serra et al.
By
Ashok K. Mannava
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg No.: 45,301
Date: June 30, 2008
Telephone: (703) 652-3822

Rev 10/07(AppBrief)
Total number of pages: 27

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 200313958-1
App. Ser. No.: 10/697,688

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s):	Bill Serra et al.	**Confirmation No.:**	9830
Serial No.:	10/697,688	**Examiner:**	James J. Debrow
Filed:	October 31, 2003	**Group Art Unit:**	2176

Title: DETERMINING A LOCATION FOR PLACING DATA IN A SPREADSHEET BASED ON A LOCATION OF THE DATA SOURCE

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS

Sir:

This is an Appeal Brief in connection with the decisions of the Examiner in a Final Office Action mailed February 26, 2008, and in connection with the Notice of Appeal filed April 28, 2008. Each of the topics required in an Appeal Brief and a Table of Contents are presented herewith and labeled appropriately. It is noted that an Appeal Brief was previously filed on May 22, 2007, whereafter the examiner reopened prosecution.

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 200313958-1
App. Ser. No.: 10/697,688

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 200313958-1
App. Ser. No.: 10/697,688

(1) Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, L.P.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The Appellant is unaware of any appeals or interferences related to this case.

(3) Status of Claims

Claims 4 and 22 have been canceled. Claims 1-3, 5-21, and 23-34 are pending, of which claims 1, 9, 17, 25 and 30 are independent. Claims 1-3, 5-21, and 23-34 are all rejected and are all appealed.

(4) Status of Amendments

No amendment was filed subsequent to the Final Office Action dated February 26, 2008.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

It should be understood that the claimed subject matter is supported in at least the following cited sections of the present application. Thus, other sections in the present application may provide the same or additional supports as well.

According to claim 1, a method implemented by a computerized system comprising:

receiving data from a data source (710, FIG. 7; p. 21, ll. 10-20);

determining a geographical location of the data source (p. 21, ll. 17-27);

determining a location in an electronic spreadsheet for placing at least a portion of the data, wherein the determined spreadsheet location is based on the determined geographical location of the data source (750, FIG. 7; p. 23, ll. 1-10);

inserting the data portion in the electronic spreadsheet at the determined spreadsheet location (760, FIG. 7; p. 23, ll. 10+); and

displaying the electronic spreadsheet to a user, wherein the electronic spreadsheet indicates the geographical location of the data source from a display of the data portion inserted at the determined location (p. 23, ll. 13-23).

According to claim 9, a method of using an electronic spreadsheet to display information at locations in the spreadsheet associated with the origin of the information, the method comprising:

receiving data from a plurality of sensors, each of the plurality of sensors situated at a separate geographical location (710, FIG. 7; p. 21, ll. 10-20);

determining the separate geographical location of each of the plurality of sensors (p. 21, ll. 17-27);

determining locations in the spreadsheet based on the determined separate geographical locations of the plurality of sensors such that one or more of at least a portion of the data from each of the plurality of sensors and a value is operable to be displayed in one or more of the locations in the electronic spreadsheet, wherein the value is calculated from at least some of the data from the plurality of sensors (750, FIG. 7; p. 23, ll. 1-10);

inserting the data portion from each of the plurality of sensors in the electronic spreadsheet at each of the determined spreadsheet locations (760, FIG. 7; p. 23, ll. 10-20); and

providing a display in the electronic spreadsheet to a user at least one of the data portions inserted in one of the determined spreadsheet locations, wherein the display indicates the separate geographical location of one of the plurality of sensors (p. 23, ll. 13-23).

According to claim 17, a system comprising:

a plurality of data sensors (120a-n, FIG. 1; p. 6, ll. 14-24); and

a computing platform operable to identify a geographical location of each of the data sensors; the computing platform is further operable to designate locations in an electronic spreadsheet based on the identified geographical locations of the plurality of data sensors to display at the designated locations in the electronic spreadsheet at least one of the data from the plurality of sensors and a value calculated from the data from one or more of the plurality of sensors (110, FIG. 1; p. 6, l. 21 to p. 9, l. 4); and

wherein the computing platform conveys to a user, via the electronic spreadsheet, a display of the at least one data at one of the designated locations in the electronic spreadsheet to indicate the geographical location of at least one of the data sensors (p. 9, ll. 5-10).

According to claim 25, an apparatus comprising:

means for receiving data from a plurality of sensors (110, FIG. 1; p. 6, ll. 21-31);

means for determining a geographical location of each of the plurality of sensors (110, FIG. 1; p. 6, ll. 21-31);

means for determining locations in an electronic spreadsheet based on the determined geographical locations of the plurality of sensors such that one or more of at least a portion of the data from each of the plurality of sensors and a value calculated from the data from one or more of the plurality of sensors is operable to be displayed in one or more of the determined locations in the electronic spreadsheet (110, FIG. 1; p. 6, l. 21 to p. 9, l. 4); and

means for providing a display in the electronic spreadsheet to a user at least one of the data portions inserted in one of the determined spreadsheet locations, wherein the display indicates the geographical location of one of the plurality of sensors (110, FIG. 1; p. 6, ll. 21 to p. 9, l. 4).

According to claim 30, a computer readable medium on which is embedded a program, the program performing a method, the method comprising:

receiving data from a data source (710, FIG. 7; p. 21, ll. 10-20);

determining a geographical location of the data source (p. 21, ll. 17-27);

determining a location in an electronic spreadsheet for placing at least a portion of the data, wherein the determined spreadsheet location is based on the determined geographical location of the data source (750, FIG. 7; p. 23, ll. 1-10);

inserting the data portion in the electronic spreadsheet at the determined spreadsheet location (760, FIG. 7; p. 23, ll. 10-20); and

displaying the electronic spreadsheet to a user, wherein the electronic spreadsheet indicates the geographical location of the data source from a display of the data portion inserted at the determined location (p. 23, ll. 13-23).

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 200313958-1
App. Ser. No.: 10/697,688

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

a) Whether claims 1-3, 5-21, and 23-34 should have been rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Orr et al. (5,808,916) in view of Hsiung et al. (2003/0144746).

(7) Arguments

A. The rejection of claims 1-3, 5-21, and 23-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Orr et al. in view of Hsiung et al. should be reversed

The test for determining if a claim is rendered obvious by one or more references for purposes of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is set forth in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S._, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007):

> "Under §103, the scope and content of the prior art are to be determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved. Against this background the obviousness or nonobviousness of the subject matter is determined. Such secondary considerations as commercial success, long felt but unsolved needs, failure of others, etc., might be utilized to give light to the circumstances surrounding the origin of the subject matter sought to be patented." Quoting *Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966).

As set forth in MPEP 2143.03, to ascertain the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue, "[a]ll claim limitations must be considered" because "all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385. According to the Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness Under

35 U.S.C. 103 in view of *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, Federal Register, Vol. 72, No. 195, 57526, 57529 (October 10, 2007), once the *Graham* factual inquiries are resolved, there must be a determination of whether the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art based on any one of the following proper rationales:

> (A) Combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results; (B) Simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results; (C) Use of known technique to improve similar devices (methods, or products) in the same way; (D) Applying a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results; (E) "Obvious to try"—choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, with a reasonable expectation of success; (F) Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art; (G) Some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S._, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

It is respectfully noted that the application of any of these rationales is to occur *only* after a Graham factual inquiry has been properly performed.

Independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, and 30

The Office Action admitted that Orr et al. does not disclose the following claimed features:

> "determining a location in an electronic spreadsheet for placing at least a portion of the data, wherein the determined spreadsheet location is based on the determined geographical location of the data source;
>
> inserting the data portion in the electronic spreadsheet at the determined spreadsheet location; and

> displaying the electronic spreadsheet to a user, wherein the electronic spreadsheet indicates the geographical location of the data source from a display of the data portion inserted at the determined location."

However, the Office Action alleged that such features are taught by Hsiung et al. because at its paragraphs [363]–[365],

> "Hsiung teaches sensors may be described by a naming convention that makes them easy to identify. Hsiung also teaches a function may be provides [sic] which enables the Model Builder to associate a sensor with a column of data in the spreadsheet. Using the broadest interpretation, the Examiner concludes that the naming convention to identify the sensors could include but not be limited to the geographical location of the sensor."

It is respectfully submitted that a proper Graham inquiry has not been performed. Specifically, the Office Action failed to properly ascertain the differences between the alleged prior art, Hsiung et al., and the aforementioned features in independent claims 1, 9, 17, 25, and 30. As noted above, ironically, the Office Action insisted on "using the *broadest* possible reasonable interpretation" (emphasis added) of Hsiung et al. to reject the *specific* features of the claimed invention. This is akin to, for example, citing a broadly-termed "vehicle" to reject a specifically-claimed "space shuttle" just because the "space shuttle" is also a vehicle, despite the fact a vehicle may include other transportation means such as an automobile, a train, and an airplane, to name a few.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner cannot employ the "broadest reasonable interpretation" of any reference as a basis to further add specific features in the reference that are not even taught or suggested by the reference, especially when such added features are particular to the claimed invention. To do so would amount to an improper reading of such a reference just so to reject the specifically-claimed invention based on improper

hindsight. Furthermore, it is not clear how the naming of a sensor to reflect its geographical location is supposed to teach one skilled in the art to place data from such a sensor in a spreadsheet location that is previously determined to correspond with the geographical location of the sensor as claimed.

Indeed, it is respectfully submitted that Hsiung et al. clearly states in paragraph [0365] that,

> Model Builders may also select the source of the training data. Training data can come from a real-time data server, a historical data server, or from a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Model Builders may specify the location of the training data for each sensor or model that is used as input to the model. If training data is being imported from an Excel spreadsheet, *data fields from the spreadsheet may be mapped to the appropriate sensor*. A function may be provided which enables the Model Builder to associate a sensor with a column of data in the spreadsheet. (Emphasis added).

Thus, the Model Builders may specify the location of the training data, e.g., as imported from an Excel spreadsheet, for each sensor by mapping such data from the spreadsheet to the appropriate sensor. In contrast, independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 25 and 30 recite the reverse, i.e., "determining [or identifying] a geographical location of the data source [or sensor]" and then

> determining [or designating] a location in an electronic spreadsheet for placing at least a portion of the data based on the determined geographical location of the data source; (emphasis added).

Consequently, as claimed, a display of the data portion at a determined location in the spreadsheet provides indication of the geographical location of the data source. In other words, these claims recite a mapping from a geographical location of the data source to a location in a spreadsheet based on the geographical location of the data source. For example, as illustrated in FIGs. 3A and 5, the data center 300 may be divided into four geographical sections, 350-353

(FIG. 3A). Because the labeled temperature sensors 320a-f are located in the upper left section 350, their data are mapped to the upper left cells B2, C2, D2, B3, C3, and D3 of the spreadsheet illustrated in FIG. 5. Thus, the data mapping to the spreadsheet is based on the determined geographical location of the sensors 320a-f, and a user viewing the spreadsheet is able to ascertain from the data in the upper left cells in the spreadsheet that there are sensors located in the upper left section 350 of the data center 300. The same can be seen for sensors 320 in the upper right section 351 (FIG. 3A), which correspond to data found in the upper right cells H2, I2, J2, H3, I3, and J3, and so on. Accordingly, the claimed mapping is in reverse to the data mapping in Hsiung et al., which involves mapping of training data from a spreadsheet to import *into* (not out of) the sensors. Also, the claimed mapping is done based on the determined geographical location of the data source, which Hsiung et al. completely disregards when it initially enters the training data into the spreadsheet, before such training data is sent out the sensors.

Although Hsiung et al. states that "a function may be provided which enables the Model Builder to associate a sensor with a column of data in the spreadsheet," this association is only done after the data has been placed in the spreadsheet. In other words, such an association between a data column in the spreadsheet and the sensor was not determined prior to allowing such data to be initially placed at a particular location in the spreadsheet *based on* the geographical location of the sensor. Consequently, Hsiung et al. is not at all concerned about placing data in proper locations in a spreadsheet, where those spreadsheet locations are used to actually indicate actual geographical location of the data sources, because any subsequent

correlation between a cell data in the spreadsheet with a particular sensor is done after the data has been placed in the cell. Thus, the placement of data in a cell is not at all based on the data source from which such data originated.

In the Response to Arguments section on pages 32-33 of the Final Office Action, the examiner alleged that,

> "Hsiung also teaches "If training data is being imported from an Excel spreadsheet, data fields from the spreadsheet may be mapped to the appropriate sensor." (0365). The Examiner concludes that the used [sic] of the word "if" makes it clear that data being imported from an Excel spreadsheet is but one option of supplying data to the spreadsheet and not the only method as can be seen in sections, e.g. sensors (0290; 0363; 0391-0393)."

It is respectfully submitted that paragraph [0290] in Hsiung actually states, "Data may be imported from on-line or off-line databases, spreadsheets, physical models, or text files." Thus, again, as noted earlier, Hsiung discusses the retrieval of data from a spreadsheet, which is in contrast to the placement of data from a data source in the electronic spreadsheet, wherein the placement is based on the determined geographical location of the data source as claimed.

Likewise, Paragraph [0363] in Hsiung shows that its Model Builder "may choose sensors & other inputs to the model," wherein the "[s]ensors may be described either by a description field, or by a naming convention that makes them easy to identify." However, there is no showing of determining a location in an electronic spreadsheet for placing at least a portion of the data based on the determined geographical location of the data source as claimed. In other words, Hsiung does not indicate that sensor locations may be derived from the location of their data in the electronic spreadsheet as claimed.

Paragraph [391] in Hsiung indicates that model results may be exported to a spreadsheet. However, the same paragraph merely states, "[i]t is assumed that the physical model software is able to export to a spreadsheet." Thus, there is no specific discussion of placement of data from a data source in the electronic spreadsheet, wherein the placement is based on the determined geographical location of the data source as claimed. Paragraph [0392] in Hsiung actually indicates the importing of spreadsheet data. Thus, again, as noted earlier, this is in contrast to the placement of data in the spreadsheet as claimed. Finally, paragraph [0393] in Hsiung merely indicates that process sensors are assigned to "columns in the spreadsheet." That is, there is no further discussion in Hsiung that the process sensors are assigned to columns in the spreadsheet specifically based on the geographical locations of such sensors as claimed.

In the Response to Arguments section on page 33 of the Final Office Action, "[t]he Examiner interpretes [sic] Husing [sic] in a much broader since [sic] in that the function which enables the Model Builders to associate a sensor with a column of data in the spreadsheet is done in terms of providing input data to the spreadsheet from the sensors." However, the examiner has not provided evidence where in Hsiung is there a discussion that the placement of such sensor data in a column of spreadsheet is specifically based on determined geographical locations of the sensors as claimed.

Because the examiner failed to properly perform a Graham inquiry, the Examiner failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the pending claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3, 5-21, and 23-34 are allowable and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 200313958-1
App. Ser. No.: 10/697,688

(8) Conclusion

For at least the reasons given above, the rejection of claims 1-43 described above and the objection to the Abstract described above should be reversed and these claims allowed.

Please grant any required extensions of time and charge any fees due in connection with this Appeal Brief to deposit account no. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 30, 2008 By

Ashok K. Mannava
Registration No.: 45,301

MANNAVA & KANG, P.C.
11240 Waples Mill Road
Suite 300
Fairfax, VA 22030
(703) 652-3822
(703) 865-5150 (facsimile)

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 200313958-1
App. Ser. No.: 10/697,688

(9) Claim Appendix

1. A method implemented by a computerized system comprising:

receiving data from a data source;

determining a geographical location of the data source;

determining a location in an electronic spreadsheet for placing at least a portion of the data, wherein the determined spreadsheet location is based on the determined geographical location of the data source;

inserting the data portion in the electronic spreadsheet at the determined spreadsheet location; and

displaying the electronic spreadsheet to a user, wherein the electronic spreadsheet indicates the geographical location of the data source from a display of the data portion inserted at the determined location.

2. The method of claim 1, further comprises:

calculating, as a function of time, a value associated with the at least a portion of the data from the data source; and

transmitting the value to a spreadsheet program for display in the electronic spreadsheet.

3. The method of claim 1, further comprising using the at least a portion of the data from the data source to control a device.

5. The method of claim 1, further comprising transmitting the at least a portion of the data and the location in the spreadsheet to a spreadsheet program, wherein the spreadsheet program is operable to display the at least a portion of the data at the location.

6. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

calculating a total from the at least a portion of the data from the data source and at least a portion of data from at least one other data source physically located proximate the data source; and

determining a location in the spreadsheet for placing the total based on one or more of the location information for the data source and location information for the at least one other data source.

7. The method of claim 1, wherein determining a location in a spreadsheet based on the location information for the data source comprises mapping the location information for the data source to a predetermined location in the electronic spreadsheet.

8. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

identifying a view to be displayed in the spreadsheet;

determining whether the at least a portion of the data from the data source is in the view; and

transmitting the at least a portion of the data and the location in the electronic spreadsheet to a spreadsheet program in response to the at least a portion of the data being in the view, wherein the spreadsheet program is operable to display the at least a portion of the data at the location.

9. A method of using an electronic spreadsheet to display information at locations in the spreadsheet associated with the origin of the information, the method comprising:

receiving data from a plurality of sensors, each of the plurality of sensors situated at a separate geographical location;

determining the separate geographical location of each of the plurality of sensors;

determining locations in the spreadsheet based on the determined separate geographical locations of the plurality of sensors such that one or more of at least a portion of the data from each of the plurality of sensors and a value is operable to be displayed in one or more of the locations in the electronic spreadsheet, wherein the value is calculated from at least some of the data from the plurality of sensors;

inserting the data portion from each of the plurality of sensors in the electronic spreadsheet at each of the determined spreadsheet locations; and

providing a display in the electronic spreadsheet to a user at least one of the data portions inserted in one of the determined spreadsheet locations, wherein the display indicates the separate geographical location of one of the plurality of sensors.

10. The method of claim 9, further comprising:

calculating, as a function of time, the value; and

the step of determining locations in the spreadsheet comprises determining a location in the spreadsheet to display the value based on the location of at least one of the plurality of sensors.

11. The method of claim 9, further comprising controlling a device based on the value.

12. The method of claim 9, wherein the step of determining locations in the spreadsheet comprises:

selecting cells in the electronic spreadsheet to display at least one of the at least a portion of the data and the value.

13. The method of claim 9, further comprising transmitting the at least a portion of the data and the determined locations to a spreadsheet program, wherein the spreadsheet program is operable to display the at least a portion of the data in the determined locations.

14. The method of claim 9, further comprising:

dividing an area into a plurality of sections, the plurality of sensors being located in the area;

receiving a selection of a view including at least one of the plurality of sections;

determining whether any of the plurality of sensors are located in the at least one of the plurality of sections; and

transmitting data from the plurality of sensors located in the at least one of the plurality of sections and the determined locations for the plurality of sensors located in the at least one of the plurality of sections to a spreadsheet program operable to display the data from the plurality of sensors located in the at least one of the plurality of sections at the determined locations.

15. The method of claim 14, further comprising:

calculating a total from the data from at least some of the sensors located in the at least one of the plurality of sections; and

transmitting the total to a spreadsheet program operable to display the total at one of the determined locations associated with the at least some of the sensors.

16. The method of claim 9, wherein determining locations in the spreadsheet comprises mapping the locations of the plurality of sensors to predetermined locations in the electronic spreadsheet.

17. A system comprising:

a plurality of data sensors; and

a computing platform operable to identify a geographical location of each of the data sensors; the computing platform is further operable to designate locations in an electronic spreadsheet based on the identified geographical locations of the plurality of data sensors to

display at the designated locations in the electronic spreadsheet at least one of the data from the plurality of sensors and a value calculated from the data from one or more of the plurality of sensors; and

wherein the computing platform conveys to a user, via the electronic spreadsheet, a display of the at least one data at one of the designated locations in the electronic spreadsheet to indicate the geographical location of at least one of the data sensors.

18. The system of claim 17, wherein the computing platform is operable to calculate the value as a function of time.

19. The system of claim 17, further comprising at least one other electronic spreadsheet operable to use data contained in the electronic spreadsheet to perform a mathematical function.

20. The system of claim 17, further comprising at least one device controlled by the computing platform based on the data from one or more of the plurality of data sensors.

21. The system of claim 17, further comprising a configuration repository storing the data from the plurality of data sensors and the locations in the electronic spreadsheet for placing the data from the plurality of data sensors, wherein the computing platform is operable to retrieve the locations in the electronic spreadsheet from the configuration repository to determine where to place the data from the plurality of data sensors in the electronic spreadsheet.

23. The system of claim 17, wherein the plurality of sensors comprises a plurality of sensors in a data center and the computing platform is operable to facilitate the placement of the data from the plurality of the sensors in the locations in the spreadsheet associated with locations of the plurality sensors in the data center.

24. The system of claim 23, wherein the computing platform is operable to facilitate the generation of different views of the sensors in the data center, the different views being provided in the spreadsheet.

25. An apparatus comprising:

means for receiving data from a plurality of sensors;

means for determining a geographical location of each of the plurality of sensors;

means for determining locations in an electronic spreadsheet based on the determined geographical locations of the plurality of sensors such that one or more of at least a portion of the data from each of the plurality of sensors and a value calculated from the data from one or more of the plurality of sensors is operable to be displayed in one or more of the determined locations in the electronic spreadsheet; and

means for providing a display in the electronic spreadsheet to a user at least one of the data portions inserted in one of the determined spreadsheet locations, wherein the display indicates the geographical location of one of the plurality of sensors.

26. The apparatus of claim 25 further comprising means for calculating as a function of time the value.

27. The apparatus of claim 25, further comprising means for controlling a device based on the calculated value.

28. The apparatus of claim 25, further comprising storage means for storing the data from the sensors and the locations in the spreadsheet, wherein the means for determining the locations in the spreadsheet is operable to retrieve the locations in the spreadsheet from the storage means based on the locations of the plurality of sensors.

29. The apparatus of claim 25, further comprising means for receiving user selections associated with a view to be displayed in the spreadsheet, the view including at least one of the data from one or more of the plurality of sensors and the value.

30. A computer readable medium on which is embedded a program, the program performing a method, the method comprising:

receiving data from a data source;

determining a geographical location of the data source;

determining a location in an electronic spreadsheet for placing at least a portion of the data, wherein the determined spreadsheet location is based on the determined geographical location of the data source;

inserting the data portion in the electronic spreadsheet at the determined location; and

displaying the electronic spreadsheet to a user, wherein the electronic spreadsheet indicates the geographical location of the data source from a display of the data portion inserted at the determined spreadsheet location.

31. The computer readable medium of claim 30, wherein the method further comprises:

calculating, as a function of time, a value associated with the at least a portion of the data from the data source; and

transmitting the value to a spreadsheet program for display in the electronic spreadsheet.

32. The computer readable medium of claim 30, wherein the method further comprises the at least a portion of the data to control a device.

33. The computer readable medium of claim 30, wherein the method further comprises determining the location information for the data source, wherein the location information is associated with a geographical location of the data source.

34. The computer readable medium of claim 30, wherein the method further comprises transmitting the at least a portion of the data and the location in the electronic spreadsheet to a spreadsheet program, wherein the spreadsheet program is operable to display the at least a portion of the data at the location.

(10) Evidence Appendix

None.

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 200313958-1
App. Ser. No.: 10/697,688

(11) Related Proceedings Appendix

None.